



FW: Libby Asbestos Project
 DC Orr
 to:
 aastanislaus, Sean Earle, Carol Campbell
 03/21/2011 02:44 PM
[Show Details](#)

Libby 041


 1258926 - R8 SDMS

1 Attachment



scan0028.jpg

Jeff;

Here is documentation of my assertion that EPA has purposely mis-stated the issue of breaking pathways of exposure in Libby. Now that we know that EPA intends to force us to accept exposures, I will fight for the protection of human health in Libby.

EPA cannot claim they are reducing exposures in Libby, EPA is increasing cumulative exposures on this sensitized community.

Sincerely, DC Orr

From: xcav8orr@hotmail.com
 To: aastanislaus@epamail.epa.gov; earle.sean@epamail.epa.gov
 Subject: RE: Libby Asbestos Project
 Date: Fri, 4 Mar 2011 13:11:15 -0700

Jeff;

Thanks for the timely response.

The response doesn't answer my questions and actually raises more questions about this switch to "naturally occurring asbestos".

Your response implies "acceptable" levels of exposure under the IRIS Risk Model.

Mathy Stanislaus said that there would be no reason to discuss toxicity values, under IRIS of any other standard, because EPA would SEVER ALL pathways of exposure to humans.

Will EPA do what Mr. Stanislaus said they would do? Will EPA sever pathways of exposure regardless of any standard of toxicity? I have documents from Ms. Thomas stating the same thing, closure of pathways of exposure, with no discussion of toxicity values. The comments of this community requested this action.

The response you have provided is inconsistent with the word Mr. Stanislaus gave to this community. Please clarify these inconsistencies as required by the OIG "Quick Response" document.

Sincerely, DC Orr

> From: aastanislaus@epamail.epa.gov
> Subject: RE: Libby Asbestos Project
> To: xcav8orr@hotmail.com
> Date: Fri, 4 Mar 2011 09:52:25 -0500
>
> Mr. Orr,
>
> Here's what our program people have to say about the "acceptable risk"
> issue:
>
> EPA cleanups reduce exposure in order to reduce health risks at
> Superfund sites.
> Because Libby Amphibole is naturally-occurring in the Libby valley,
> EPA will not be able to remove all asbestos from the environment.
> EPA will focus on reducing exposures so that the cancer risks and
> non-cancer hazards are reduced to meet EPA's targets.
> One of the Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) for OU1 listed in the
> ROD is to "break the exposure pathways for inhalation of LA fibers
> that would result in unacceptable cancer risk or non-cancer hazard."
> We expect to meet this objective.
>
> It doesn't seem that they're prepared to say anything more at this time.
> Hope this is helpful.
>
> Jeff
>
>
> From: DC Orr <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>
>
> To: aastanislaus@EPA, <gordsull@yahoo.com>, <ropper@mt.gov>, Sean Earle/R4/USEPA/US@EPA,
> <jenniferkevin@yahoo.com>
>
> Date: 02/12/2011 11:02 AM
>
> Subject: RE: Libby Asbestos Project
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Mr. Maurer;
>
> I am quite familiar with the IRIS risk model. Maybe I am not being
> clear in asking for clarification of conflicting statements by EPA
> personnel.
> The people of Libby were told that EPA would sever all pathways of
> exposure. Mathy Stanislaus stated that EPA could move to a ROD without
> scientific toxicity numerical values because the toxicity of Libby
> Amphibole would not matter since ALL pathways of exposure would be
> severed.
> This is quite simple. It doesn't matter how dangerous a material is
> in terms of potential for harm to human health if no person comes into
> contact with the dangerous material. That is what EPA told this
> community they were going to do at OU-1, make it so that there was no
> human contact with this substance of unknown toxicity. None. Nada. Zip.

> Zilch.

> Now EPA is saying that the people using OU-1 are going to be exposed

> to "acceptable levels" of LA, and they admit this is based on the

> outdated, non-protective IRIS risk model. These acceptable levels will

> change, by up to 500 times, when numerical toxicity values are

> established. We already have the science to prove that in the work of

> Berman and Crump and the SAB.

> What happened to severing pathways of exposure? Acceptable levels of

> exposure to the contaminant of concern at the only site with a

> Declaration of Public Health Emergency, the site with the most

> documented death and disease tied directly to the contaminant of

> concern, is not acceptable when the risk model is bogus.

> You have clarified that EPA is relying on the junk-science of IRIS to

> allow exposures at OU-1 but have not explained why we were told that

> pathways of exposure would be severed when obviously this is not true.

> EPA hoped to avoid discussion of IRIS and put forth the story about

> severing pathways of exposure in an attempt to fool the people of Libby.

> EPA would not discuss IRIS because EPA took the position that there

> would be no exposure. You were able to pull the wool over the eyes of

> Richard Oppen and get him to sign the ROD. Now you and the State must

> answer for the continuing exposures you have allowed our first

> responders to suffer.

> Will EPA sever pathways of exposure at OU-1?

> Sincerely, DC Orr

>

> > From: aastanislaus@epamail.epa.gov

> > Subject: Re: Libby Asbestos Project

> > To: xcav8orr@hotmail.com

> > Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2011 17:42:38 -0500

> >

> >

> > Dear Mr. Orr,

> >

> > Thank you for your question. I know that, as a city councilman, the

> > asbestos issue is one of your top concerns. It's one of our top

> > concerns

> > as well, and we're doing our best to provide you with the information

> > you need.

> >

> > Mathy assigned me to find the specific information your looking for (I

> > work in the communications office). After a discussion with our

> > regional

> > personnel, who know the Libby asbestos issue much better than I do,

> > they

> > feel that the best explanations of our reasoning behind the decisions

> > we

> > have made regarding OU-1 pathways are found in:

> >

> > 1) Our Record of Decision:

> >

> > "The only building at OU1 that is regularly occupied by humans is the

> > Search and Rescue building. Indoor air personal air samples were

> > collected at this building to evaluate three exposure scenarios:

> > active

> > behaviors in the garage area, active behaviors in the meeting room

> > area,

> > and passive behaviors in the meeting room area. Based on the best
> > estimate of the mean air concentration, estimated cancer risk levels
> > ranges from 8E-07 (central tendency exposure (CTE) to 1E-05
> (reasonable
> > maximum exposure (RME). Based on the maximum detected concentrations,
> > estimated cancer risk levels ranges from 4E-06 (CTE) to 9E-05 (RME).
> In
> > both cases, most of the risk is associated with active behaviors, with
> > relatively little coming from passive indoor activities. These
> estimates
> > are all within or below EPA's target risk range, indicating that
> indoor
> > exposures alone are of relatively low concern. However, risks from
> > inside the building must be considered along with other exposures that
> > contribute to the total (cumulative) risk to an individual."
> >
> > and 2) In the Remedial Investigation (Section 6.7, Page 6-17):
> >
> > "Estimated excess cancer risks to volunteers who work indoors at the
> > David Thompson Search and Rescue facility are below or within EPA's
> risk
> > range. Based on this, exposure to indoor air, taken alone, is likely
> to
> > be of low concern. However, volunteers in the building may be exposed
> > to LA by other pathways, and so risk evaluations must consider the
> total
> > risk."
> >
> > I hope this answers your question.
> >
> > Sincerely,
> > Jeff Maurer
> > EPA
> >
> > ----- Forwarded by Jeff Maurer/DC/USEPA/US on 02/11/2011 05:35 PM
> -----
> >
> > From: DC Orr <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>
> >
> > To: aastanislau@EPA
> >
> > Date: 01/25/2011 12:08 PM
> >
> > Subject: Libby Asbestos Project
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Mr. Stanislaus;
> >
> > I was in the audience when you came to Libby. I was particularly
> > interested in what you had to say about OU-1 as I am a City
> Councilman.
> > You told the audience that the Toxicity Studies and Risk Assessment

> > would not impact moving to a ROD on OU-1 because EPA would be severing
 > > ALL pathways of exposure to this substance of unknown toxicity that is
 > > known as Libby Amphibole.
 > > Simply put, it would not matter if Libby Amphibole is determined to
 > > be 500 more times mesotheliogenic than the values derived from the
 > IRIS
 > > Risk model, because there would be NO exposure. EPA would sever ALL
 > > pathways of exposure. This is what you told this community that I was
 > > elected to represent and I have relayed that assurance many times.
 > > I was skeptical because of the problems we have had with our boatramp
 > > since one of EPAs' contractors fell asleep in a drunken stupor and
 > > washed out the existing cap. Bill Murray wrote a letter stating that
 > the
 > > exposure pathways which may have been caused by the washout had been
 > > closed by ERS actions.
 > > There is still visible vermiculite at the surface in that boatramp
 > > and I am concerned that EPA will consider visible vermiculite to
 > > constitute a closed pathway of exposure under the antiquated IRIS risk
 > > model. I have been assured this is not the case by EPA.
 > > The City Council is now negotiating with EPA on finalizing the
 > > Remedial Action at OU-1. The City has great plans to develop a City
 > > Park at this scenic site. Men, women, and especially children will
 > spend
 > > great amounts of their time in this Park.
 > > During negotiations, it became evident that EPA was not going to
 > > honor your commitment to close ALL pathways of exposure in OU-1. Ms.
 > > Rebecca Thomas told the Council that you have no intention of cleaning
 > > the David Thompson Search and Rescue (DTSAR) building.
 > > Mr. Stanislaus, this building is identified in the RI as a serious
 > > pathway of exposure for our first responders operating in the
 > building.
 > > It is no large task to compare this action to the "air is safe to
 > > breathe in Manhattan" scenario which is causing so much trouble in New
 > > York.
 > > This history is necessary to allow you to analyze the one single
 > > issue I am asking your office to address. Please clarify the mechanism
 > > used to justify allowing exposures to a substance of unknown toxicity
 > > for our first responders in Libby, Mt. after it has been publicly
 > stated
 > > that ALL pathways of exposure will be severed on OU-1.
 > > Thank you for your concern in this important matter.
 > > Sincerely, Councilman DC Orr